

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

KOREAN WAR VETERANS'
MEMORIAL

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the dedication of the Korean War Veterans' Memorial. The Korean war lasted 3 years, but our memories of those men and women who gave their lives and livelihoods while fighting in Korea will last forever. The Korean War Veterans' Memorial aptly provides this recognition. This tribute to the brave men and women who fought in Korea more than 40 years ago is long overdue, and I am pleased that after nearly a decade of work, the memorial will finally be unveiled today.

The memorial is also a good opportunity to improve citizen awareness of the sacrifices made, and the service given, by our veterans in defense of our Constitution and the liberties it guarantees. All too often, we take our freedoms for granted. These precious freedoms were defended by those who sacrificed their lives in times of war. They are preserved by those who exercise their rights in defense of peace.

Today, there are more living American veterans than at any point in history. They are among the reasons that the United States is the mightiest, wealthiest, most secure Nation on the Earth today. They are the reason the United States has been, and will continue to be, the bastion of support and solace for those in a world still searching for freedom and human rights.

As a Member of Congress, I am pleased to be in a position to honor our veterans. They willingly went to war to defend our freedoms and the American dream we all strive to achieve. In this time of restricted budgets and divisive rhetoric, we must pause to recall the commitment given to use by those veterans and we must honor the commitments we have made to them.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. JOE M.
BALLARD

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to, an outstanding Army officer: Maj. Gen. Joe M. Ballard. Major General Ballard most recently distinguished himself through exceptionally meritorious service, as commander, U.S. Army Engineer Center and Fort

Leonard Wood. As a result of his outstanding leadership and keen vision Fort Leonard Wood has been established as an expanding TRADOC center for excellence. He masterfully employed information-age technology, concepts and doctrine to launch the engineer regiment toward Force XXI, thereby posturing the Engineer Center to lead the Army into the 21st century.

General Ballard established Fort Leonard Wood as a force projection platform by exceeding Army and FORSCOM readiness goals within Fort Leonard Wood's tactical units and deploying combat-ready units to Haiti, Cuba, Korea, Honduras, and Panama for operations other than war.

During a period of rapidly changing force structures and declining resources, General Ballard built Fort Leonard Wood into the model of fiscal stewardship, establishing a "Total Quality" standard for TRADOC installations. Indicative of General Ballard's pursuit of excellence, Fort Leonard Wood was selected as TRADOC's "best large installation" during the 1994 "Army Communities of Excellence" competition. The resounding success of his "U-DO-IT" self-help dormitory modernization project drew such widespread praise that it was featured in Soldier magazine, the NCO Journal, and Army Times. He also saved \$1.6 million per year by converting the directorate of logistics from contract to in-house operation.

When faced with a \$10 million budget reduction in fiscal year 1995, General Ballard took the lead among TRADOC installation commanders, directing a comprehensive organizational-functional review to achieve the most efficient organization in every activity. This review will continue to direct and shape Fort Leonard Wood for the decade to come.

General Ballard's insightful planning brought to fruition the interservice training review organization. His mastery of installation management, extensive expertise on the Department of Defense Base Realignment and Closure Program, and tactical expertise in the combat support disciplines combined to promote Fort Leonard Wood as a TRADOC hub and future center for maneuver support training and combat developments and to consolidate the engineer, military police and chemical schools at Fort Leonard Wood. This exceptional vision and drive has ensured that Fort Leonard Wood will be a premier Force XXI Army Training Center.

General Ballard's accomplishments during his command of the Engineer Center at Fort Leonard Wood are in keeping with the finest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon him, the corps of engineers, and the U.S. Army. I wish him well in his new assignment as Chief of Staff of TRADOC. He and his wife Tessie made scores of friends in Missouri and we will miss them.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HOUSTON FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Houston Fire Department on its 100th anniversary and to salute these brave men and women who have served the city of Houston so well.

The full-time Houston Fire Department began at 1 minute past midnight on June 1, 1895 with 44 men and 40 horses in 7 stations to serve Houston's 9 square miles. Only 32,000 people lived in Houston, and downtown was just a few square blocks. Today, the department employs 3,115 firefighters in 81 stations that serve 1.65 million people who live throughout Houston's 594 square miles.

Today, Houston has the third largest fire department in the Nation, and its emergency medical service ambulance division is recognized as one of the Nation's best for trauma care. The department's hazardous materials response team is also among the world's most experienced in handling petrochemical leaks, spills, and incidents.

We seldom think of firefighters unless we hear a screaming siren or see the flashing light of a fire engine. But the fact that we don't think often about firefighters is a testament to how well they do their job—we comfortably go about our everyday lives because we know that these dedicated people stand ready to respond quickly and effectively in an emergency.

So it is appropriate to mark this anniversary by thanking those who provide us with this everyday security and who stand ready to risk their lives to protect us. Much of firefighting is undramatic—keeping equipment in condition, teaching fire prevention, anticipating causes of fire. But a life-and-death emergency is always only a 911 call away, and firefighters and their families live with that constant risk. For that, we say thank you.

It is especially appropriate that the Houston Fire Museum, is sponsoring a celebration to honor these men and women for their 100 years of dedication and service. And I congratulate the museum on the service it provides in honoring firefighters and educating the public about the importance of fire safety and the history of the fire service.

Again, I would like to congratulate the Houston Fire Department and the men and women who have dedicated themselves to serving others. For 100 years, they have kept the city of Houston safe.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

A NOT-SO-HAPPY BIRTHDAY FOR MEDICARE

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 30th anniversary of the Medicare Program—a program that has successfully provided much-needed health care benefits to millions of older Americans.

Unfortunately, there is a very dark side to this week's celebration. Medicare is under attack, and the new majority threatens to make deep and dangerous cuts in this critical program.

Their disdain for the Medicare system is not new. These are the same uncaring folks who 30 years ago claimed that Medicare was socialized medicine. The same people who fought every expansion of the program. The same people who last year, given the chance to save our health care system, said there was no crisis.

And now, the new majority has targeted Medicare to pay for their tax cuts for the wealthy. In return, 37 million seniors—people who have worked hard, paid their taxes all their life—will see their Medicare benefits slashed and their quality of care eroded.

Dipping into Medicare to make up for an unrelated tax cut is quite simply an outrage. Medicare is a sacred compact with America's seniors—not a fiscal candy jar.

Next year when we celebrate Medicare's anniversary, I want to be able to look seniors straight in the eye and say "yes, we have kept our word, and we have honored the compact we made with you."

I know I'll keep my promise and I hope a new, new majority will do the same.

TRIBUTE TO CARLY JARMON

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the 1995 Miss Texas, Carly Jarmon. I am pleased that Ms. Jarmon, representing the Oak Cliff area in my congressional district, will be competing in the Miss America Pageant in September.

Miss Jarmon is currently a sophomore at Texas Tech University in Lubbock where she is a public relations-advertising major. Upon graduation, Miss Jarmon hopes to become a public relations advocate for charitable and nonprofit organizations.

A volunteer at Methodist Medical Center, Miss Jarmon has chosen organ and tissue donation awareness as the focus for her year of service as Miss Texas. Her "Circle of Life" message will be spread across the State of Texas, where she will speak to over 300,000 children and adults about the importance of organ donation.

This talented young woman is not only an inspiration to the residents of Oak Cliff, but she is also a great inspiration for the many

Texans who will be cheering for her during the Miss America Pageant. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Miss Jarmon on her recent accomplishment, and I would also like to wish her lots of luck as she vies for the crown of Miss America 1995.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHNSON CHESTNUT WHITTAKER

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Johnson Chestnut Whittaker. This individual, one of the first black cadets to attend West Point, was posthumously commissioned as a second lieutenant by President Clinton in a White House ceremony earlier this week. The road to achieving this high honor has been long and arduous for the descendants of this distinguished American.

Many of us have followed closely recent press stories which detail a shameful incident in our Nation's history. In 1880, Johnson Chestnut Whittaker, a black West Point cadet, was found beaten and unconscious in his room. Although his legs had been tied and his face and hands were slashed, West Point administrators falsely accused Johnson of staging a racist attack on himself. Following a court martial in 1881, Johnson Chestnut Whittaker was expelled from the institution.

Mr. Speaker, despite the grave injustice which he suffered at West Point, Johnson Chestnut Whittaker persevered and made great achievements. During his lifetime he practiced law, served as a high school principal, and taught psychology. Johnson Whittaker died in 1931, never realizing that one day, his descendants would stand proudly to receive the rank and honor which was never afforded him by West Point.

One hundred and fifteen years following the West Point incident, and 64 years after the death of Johnson Chestnut Whittaker, his granddaughter, Cecil Whittaker Pequette, received the gold-plated bars from President Clinton, posthumously commissioning him as a second lieutenant. In his remarks at the White House ceremony, President Clinton noted that, "We cannot undo history. But today, finally, we can pay tribute to a great American and we can acknowledge a great injustice."

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that many in this Chamber share the President's sentiments. I offer my heartfelt appreciation to Cecil Whittaker Pequette and other members of the Whittaker family for their unyielding pursuit of justice. We pause today in this Chamber to pay special tribute to 2d Lt. Johnson Chestnut Whittaker.

HONORING KOREAN VETERANS

HON. ROSA L. DELAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today Americans everywhere will turn their attention to our

Nation's Capital and pay long-overdue tribute to those who fought and lost their lives in Korea. The monument being dedicated today in Washington is a proud symbol of our gratitude for the efforts of the American men and women who proudly served our country in Korea.

I cannot help but feel the emotion as I talk to Korean war vets from Connecticut who have come to the Capital for this solemn occasion. They are here today to honor their friends and comrades who gave their lives for their country.

Freedom, democracy, and opportunity—these are the foundations of our society. These ideals are what set America apart, but too often, we take them for granted. We must never forget that our freedom was achieved, and has been maintained, at a cost. Countless American men and women have put their lives on the line to uphold and defend these guiding principles.

This national monument recognizing men and women who so bravely served our country in Korea, is long overdue. While the soldiers who fought in World War II and in Vietnam have rightfully been recognized with national memorials, the Korean veterans have not. Today, our Korean vets are finally getting the national recognition that they too deserve.

I salute our Korean war veterans for the contributions that they have made to this great country of ours. This memorial marks a milestone as we begin to pay the debt of honor owed those Americans who lost their lives in Korea.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CARL S. CLEVELAND, JR.

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I wish to pay tribute to Dr. Carl S. Cleveland, Jr., of Kansas City, MO. Dr. Cleveland, Jr., who was known worldwide as a chiropractic lecturer, passed away at the age of 77, at his home in Kansas City. At the time of his death he was serving as chancellor of the Cleveland Chiropractic College of Kansas City and Los Angeles.

Dr. Cleveland, Jr., served as president of the Cleveland Chiropractic College of Kansas City and of Los Angeles, before being appointed chancellor. He also served as chairman of the Board of Directors of the Unity Temple. Dr. Cleveland, Jr., was a graduate of the University of Nebraska and the Cleveland Chiropractic College.

Dr. Cleveland, Jr., was an institutional member of the Council on Chiropractic Education, and a founding member of the Beta Chi Rho Fraternity. He was also a member of the Association of Chiropractic Colleges and the Sigma Chi Fraternity.

Dr. Cleveland, Jr., is survived by his son, Dr. Carl S. Cleveland III, his daughter-in-law, five grandchildren, and his sister-in-law. He will be remembered by all who knew him, as an outstanding citizen of Missouri and the United States.

KURDS IN TURKEY: THE TRUE STORY

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the relationship between Turkey, its Kurdish population, and the PKK—the Kurdistan Workers Party—is greatly misunderstood. Contrary to what Turkey's critics in the United States Congress would like the rest of the world to believe, Turkey's Kurdish population is not oppressed by the Government. In fact, the Turkish Constitution provides that all citizens, including Kurds, have the same political rights and civil liberties which they may exercise equally, without impediment, regardless of ethnic or religious background.

Turkish citizens of Kurdish origin live freely throughout Turkey, and participate in all walks of life without discrimination. Kurds are doctors, lawyers, teachers, and artists. This is an important fact that is widely misunderstood. Twenty-five percent of the Turkish Parliament is composed of Kurdish Turks, even though only 18 percent of the general population is Kurdish. Turkey's Deputy Prime Minister is Kurdish. Even Turkey's former President Turgut Ozal was Kurdish.

In addition, Turkey works to protect the livelihood of Kurds in northern Iraq. When Saddam Hussein attacked his own Kurdish citizens with poisonous gas years before the gulf war, Turkey opened its doors and clothed, fed, and sheltered them until it was safe for them to return to their homes. After the gulf war, Turkey again accepted half a million Kurds fleeing from Saddam Hussein's tyranny. Today, Turkey hosts Operation Provide Comfort, the international effort which operates from Turkish bases to protect Iraqi Kurds.

These facts, however, are overshadowed by Turkey's fight against the PKK—Kurdistan Workers Party—a Marxist-Leninist terrorist group that is supported by Iran, Iraq, and Syria. Western societies fail to understand that the Kurds now fighting against Turkey are not the same Kurds suffering under the brutality of Saddam Hussein. Although the Kurdish people of Turkey have little sympathy for the PKK, the PKK has the audacity to claim that it represents the Kurdish people.

Another little-known fact about PKK terrorists is that they are not all Kurds. The PKK ranks include mercenaries and the unemployed from a host of other countries. The only support it receives from within Turkey, it extorts from innocent Kurdish businesses. The PKK is only able to continue its war against Turkey by maintaining bases outside of Turkey, such as one in Syria's Bekaa Valley, and training with other extremist organizations. Not only is the PKK unrepresentative of the true aspirations of the Kurdish people, but its goal of "freeing the Kurdish people" is ironic when one considers what the PKK is ultimately seeking to accomplish: To set up an independent Kurdistan State based on Marxist-Leninist ideology. Such a Marxist-Leninist State would endanger the lives of many Turks and Kurdish Turks living in the region and threaten peace and stability throughout the entire Middle East.

Since its inception in 1984, the PKK has based its operations on intimidation. To force its ideology upon the masses, the PKK uses an extensive policy of oppression, and forces villagers, both Turks and Kurdish Turks, who are loyal to the State, to vacate their villages and move elsewhere. It has killed thousands of civilians, many of whom are the same Kurds that the PKK claims to represent, while sabotaging economic development projects that would assist in the strengthening of democracy in Turkey. It has also extorted money from the Kurds. Those who resist are murdered in groups. Their houses are burnt, and their harvests and livestock are destroyed. It is absurd to say that the PKK is an organization waging an armed struggle for the freedom of the Kurdish people.

What we are dealing with is a group that could seriously undermine the future of democracy in Turkey. It has defied the laws that are designed to promote economic opportunity and preserve law and order, in a democratic society that respects the rights and freedoms of all people in the region. Supporting a strong democratic Turkey in a generally volatile region has long been regarded as important to the United States. Therefore, it is in the interest of the United States to support Turkey's policies to combat PKK terrorism. It is not correct, however, to target Turkey's fight against terrorists like the PKK as a sign of democracy in danger. On the contrary, true danger would be signified if a democratic government were unwilling to protect its country's territorial integrity or its citizens' human rights from the inhuman measures of a terrorist organization.

By conditioning and threatening to cut off aid to Turkey, the United States is undermining a democratic government that is only seeking to protect its citizens and its territorial integrity. It is especially counterproductive to condemn Turkey's policies at this critical juncture when the Turkish Parliament is considering a series of constitutional reforms to bring Turkey's laws in line with those of the European Union, and just recently approved a 6-month extension of Operation Comfort to provide relief to Iraqi Kurds in northern Iraq. In order to promote Turkish democracy, the United States should support Prime Minister Ciller in her efforts to fight PKK terrorism and improve democracy. The Turkish people deserve the support of their democratic allies in the face of PKK intimidation.

VOTE FRAUD IN AMERICA

HON. ROBERT L. EHRLICH, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House Oversight Committee held its first hearing on vote fraud in America, geared primarily to the Federal motor-voter law. Officials and advocates from around the country spoke of abuses and misconduct during the balloting process. In California, witnesses testified non-citizens regularly voted, as did a 5-year-old child and a dog. In Alabama, witnesses reported three briefcases containing 1,100 completed absentee ballots were hand carried to

an election board on election day. These and similar incidents impugn the integrity of this country's election process.

This issue is particularly important to me in light of allegations of electoral abuse and official misconduct in Maryland during the last gubernatorial election, which was decided by a record slim margin of several thousand votes. Concerned citizens from around the State began to investigate widespread reported irregularities the day following the election.

Besides problems with extremely lax voting booth security, these investigations determined 34,000 voters were not purged in Baltimore City in 1994 prior to the elections as required by law.

The Baltimore City election supervisor was reminded by a deputy 7 months prior to the election that the purge had not been conducted. It was never done, and that fact appears to have been concealed from city and State election officials. The enormous implications of this official malfeasance is apparent from the following sample facts about the November election:

A computer analysis done of total vote counts for each of the 408 precincts in Baltimore City using the Baltimore City Election Board electronic tape of registered voters and the certified list of votes cast on election day forwarded to the State board of elections revealed 5,929 more votes were cast in the election than individuals recorded as having appeared to have voted at the polls or by absentee ballot.

Another analysis was done comparing the same electronic tape of registered voters in Baltimore City with records of abandoned houses provided by the city housing commission. This revealed a total of 667 votes cast in the election. Furthermore, 1,881 votes were cast from houses owned by either the mayor and city council of Baltimore or the city housing authority. There is compelling evidence that a total of as many as 2,548 votes were cast from abandoned or unoccupied buildings. Where did these voters live?

Deceased voters still exercised their right to vote. Analysis of voter authority cards, precinct binder printouts, and requests for absentee ballots revealed that a possible total of 42 votes were cast by people no longer living.

Was their a direct correlation between the failure to purge and these terrible statistics? I think there was. So did State election board officials. After these facts were discovered, the State election board made a bipartisan call for the purge to be conducted after the fact to correct the previous mistake.

Let me reiterate, the State board of elections consisting of three Democrats and three Republicans wanted the purge done to prevent similar problems in the future.

Instead, the State attorney general's office represented the city election board against the State election board and convinced the court to retroactively apply the motor-voter law in order to prevent any purges from being conducted.

This is not the purpose for which the motor voter law was designed. Clearly, we in Congress are concerned that similar problems are not repeated in any State or Federal elections.

Problems such as those encountered in Maryland should be corrected immediately. Vigorous investigation must be conducted to determine if there was any fraud or official misconduct. If there is evidence of such behavior, it should be prosecuted to the fullest extent possible. It should not and must not be condoned or ignored using the cloak of law applied retroactively.

Mr. Speaker, in an election there is no such thing as a little fraud. Such behavior attacks the very foundation of our society because it destroys the fundamental trust between voters and their elected government. To tolerate such abuse or circumvent the laws designed to protect the sanctity of the citizens right to vote by any means possible will only make Americans more cynical and disinterested. In Maryland, we must not let this situation happen again.

EMPLOYEE LEGISLATION

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will resolve an issue of great concern to employees of our Nation's community colleges.

Under current Labor Department interpretation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, classified employees of community colleges—instructional aides, bus drivers, groundskeepers, and other school support personnel—are prevented from pursuing an expanded role as instructors.

Many classified employees earn academic certification in order to teach certain courses at the community college where they are employed. Unfortunately, current law makes it cost-prohibitive for community colleges to allow these employees to each in addition to their regular duties.

The legislation I am introducing today will allow classified employees of community colleges to teach, in addition to their regular duties, without violating the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The Department of Labor's requirement that classified employees must be paid a blended overtime rate that reflects both their compensation for their full-time work in a classified capacity and the higher rate as instructors makes the use of these workers impractical.

If these employees were paid a time-and-a-half overtime rate computed solely on their classified wage, the costs would diminish substantially and community colleges would be able to utilize these workers, who already have a commitment to education and want to pursue an expanded role as instructors.

My bill has been endorsed by the California School Employees Association and the American Association of Classified School Employees.

I urge my colleagues to join me and the co-sponsors of this bill in supporting this much needed change in the law.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO THE WORLD LEAGUE FOR FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging the many accomplishments of the World League for Freedom and Democracy [WLFD] in its 40 years of existence. The World League for Freedom and Democracy is an international organization comprised of some 137 member nations whose primary goal has been to promote the principles of democratic forms of government, free enterprise, and human rights among all people of the world. WLFD has long been an advocate of worldwide democracy, monitoring various parts of the world to ensure that human rights are upheld.

WLFD should be commended for being a strong voice for the principles of universal political freedom and the rights and responsibilities of the democratic process for all citizens of a country. WLFD, along with the United Nations, was formed with the intent of maintaining a peaceful dialog between nations and stabilizing relations between sovereign governments.

This year, WLFD is holding its 27th annual conference at the United Nations. I am honored to participate in WLFD's dinner to welcome the over 250 delegates attending the U.N. conference from over 50 countries, including the Presidents of Costa Rica and Fiji. It is also with great pride that I was chosen to share my experiences and lend my support to the continuing struggle to secure human rights in all parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the WLFD as they continue their crucial mission, because the fight for freedom and democracy serves in the interests of all humanity.

TRIBUTE TO EDDIE DEE SMITH

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that makes America great is the fact that in towns and cities across the face of our country there are citizens who are willing to step forward and dedicate their talents and energies to make life better for their friends and neighbors. Riverside County has been fortunate to have many such citizens. Men and women who have given freely of themselves so that our beautiful area in southern California will continue to be a desirable place to live for generations to come. Mrs. Eddie Dee Smith is one of these exceptional citizens.

A ceremony is scheduled on August 5 to rededicate the Rubidoux Senior Center as the Eddie Dee Smith Senior Center.

The North Rubidoux Women's Club, founded in Smith's home in 1954, was the driving force in getting the center established. Eddie

Dee Smith was the club's founding vice president. She was also the senior center's director from 1977 to 1981.

Eddie Dee Smith has always been at the forefront of Rubidoux's advancement. She was a founder of the Mount Calvary Baptist Church, the Mount Vernon Baptist Church, the Rubidoux Senior Center, head of the Jurupa Area Girl Scouts, member of the Avalon Park Committee, regent of the Jensen-Alvarado Ranch, president of the Jurupa Democrat Club, and 1993 Jurupa Chamber of Commerce citizen of the year.

On behalf of the many people whose lives this remarkable woman has touched, I would like to add my personal congratulations, and the thanks of the people of the 43d Congressional District.

CELEBRATING UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA PARTNERSHIP AND THE STATE VISIT OF PRESIDENT KIM YONG-SAM

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the long United States partnership with the Republic of Korea spanning nearly five decades will be celebrated this week in two major events. The first is the visit of South Korea's democratically elected President, Kim Yong-sam, and his address today to a joint session of Congress. The second will be the dedication of the long-awaited Korean War Memorial. It is a great pleasure to have President Kim here with us, and a source of immense satisfaction that those who fought our most forgotten war are finally being appropriately remembered and honored. Meanwhile, South Korea has emerged as a robust industrial power and a fully functioning democracy, and a steadfast United States friend.

CELEBRATING SOUTH KOREA'S DEMOCRACY

How South Korea moved with United States encouragement into the family of democratic nations, and the pivotal role played by President Kim, deserves reiteration.

In 1987, South Korea began a transition to democracy after 26 years of military-dominated governments. A new constitution was adopted, and free elections for President and a National Assembly subsequently were held.

President Kim Yong-sam had fought for a democratic South Korea since the 1960's. He had endured constant harassments and periods of confinement from the military-dominated regimes. Elected President in December 1992, Kim Yong-sam is the first South Korean leader since 1961 from a purely civilian background.

STRENGTH OF UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA SECURITY TIES

United States-Republic of Korea security relations were forged in blood during the Korean war and formally established in 1953. The dedication of the Korean war memorial during President Kim's visit to Washington symbolizes the long, intimate United States-Republic of Korea security relationship, including participation in the Korean and Vietnam wars.

The United States stations 37,000 troops in South Korea as the embodiment of its defense commitment to South Korea. These and other United States forces stationed in the western Pacific area are an essential element in maintaining stability in the Asia-Pacific region and in ensuring that North Korea will never dare to attack the South.

THREAT POSED BY NORTH KOREA

At present, our security relationship faces its strongest test in dealing with the nuclear threat posed by North Korea. South Korea has supported the United States-North Korea agreed framework despite the mixed impact the agreed framework has on North Korea-South Korea relations and the security situation on the Korean peninsula. This commitment includes up to \$3 billion to finance the light-water reactor project.

Analysts contend that North Korea views the agreed framework as a window of opportunity to isolate South Korea diplomatically, divide South Korea and the United States, and draw the United States into a bilateral peace agreement. I am committed to seeing that this does not happen. This issue has been addressed in House Joint Resolution 83, the first legislation reported out by the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific since I became chairman in January. The resolution has been reported out favorably by the full House International Relations Committee.

I am confident that this statement of congressional policy can materially assist the administration in removing any illusions that North Korea might entertain about American determination to demand full adherence to the essential provisions of the accord—if they properly use this expression of congressional views.

UNITED STATES-SOUTH KOREAN TRADE RELATIONS

South Korea has grown during the past decade as a market for United States exports. In recent years trade has become increasingly more balanced. Between 1985 and the end of 1994 United States exports tripled to \$18 billion, while our imports of South Korean goods doubled. The United States had a relatively small \$2 billion trade deficit with South Korea in 1994 on total trade of \$38 billion. Thus far during 1995 the United States enjoys a surplus.

South Korea has taken steps to remove many barriers to imports and otherwise to improve the environment for foreign trade and investment. During the past 5 years the Republic of Korea Government has significantly lowered import tariffs and has liberalized its import licensing regime to permit a greater range of products to enter the country unimpeded.

South Korea also has been one of the most important countries supporting the 18-member Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation [APEC] organization.

Problems remain in United States-South Korean economic relations, for instance in discriminatory treatment of automobile imports, and in the use of standards, certification, and testing requirements to discriminate against foreign goods, especially agricultural products.

Mr. Speaker, I remain persuaded that these and other problems can be resolved and that both our political, security, and economic ties will continue to grow and flourish. It is a privilege to play a role in welcoming President Kim Yong-sam to Washington.

QUESTIONABLE NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION GRANTS AWARDED IN OREGON

HON. WES COOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exhaustive and very professional research done by my constituents Bob and Sharon Beck and the Oregon Cattlemen's Association regarding how environmental groups receiving Federal funding engage in political advocacy which threatens the survival of ranchers and other public land users.

Oregon ranchers are painfully aware that certain environmental groups have an agenda which includes putting them out of business. Unfortunately, Pacific Rivers Council and Waterwatch of Oregon, Inc.—two of the more radical and litigious of these groups—have received substantial Federal grants from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation [NFWF].

Although NFWF maintains it places restrictions against grantees using Federal funds for lobbying and litigation, at the very least these Federal funds free up other resources for these environmental groups to use for political advocacy.

As my colleagues are well aware, this problem has extended far beyond the NFWF to many other nonprofit groups that receive Federal funds. Representatives MCINTOSH, ISTOOK, and EHRLICH have documented many horror stories in this regard and intend to offer an amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill to limit this abuse of taxpayers dollars. I strongly support their efforts and hope similar amendments are adopted to all appropriations bills.

Although I believe the NFWF should have its Federal funding terminated, the Interior appropriations bill—H.R. 1977—contained \$4 million for the NFWF for fiscal year 1996. However, I am encouraged that the committee report—House Report 104-173—accompanying this bill clearly states that fiscal year 1996 is the last year for Federal funding of NFWF. It is imperative to ranchers like Bob and Sharon Beck that this Federal funding be terminated as the committee report promises.

I would urge my colleagues to read the following articles from Beef Today, the Chicago Tribune, and the Washington Times on how Federal funds from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation are used for lobbying and litigation by environmental groups.

[From Beef Today, June-July 1995]

WEST SIDE STORY

(By Patricia Peak Klintberg)

In the high country above Oregon's Grande Ronde Valley, an occasional spray of daffodils or crocuses is all that remains of homesteads now long gone. It is in the valley below that one finds ranchers like Bob and Sharon Beck, offspring of the hardest pioneers.

Though they thrive in this emerald valley, criss-crossed with creeks brim-full in spring, the battle they fight today is just as dangerous, and infinitely more complex, than their ancestors' struggles against the elements.

"The agenda of some environmental groups in this state is to put us out of business," says a no-nonsense Sharon Beck.

The groups deny this charge. But the cumulative effects of the litigation they bring—and even of their well-meaning projects—is to raise the cost of doing business for public-lands ranchers. This is a story about how environmental groups prosper by tapping into endless sources of funding—some of it straight from taxpayers.

Consider the Eugene-based Pacific Rivers Council (PRC). This is the group behind last July's injunction halting all ongoing activities that could affect salmon in Oregon's Umatilla and Willowa-Whitman national forests, where the Becks are permittees.

"We were out of town and read about it in the newspaper," recalls Sharon Beck. "We were stunned. Our cattle were in the forest." Ultimately, the Forest Service ordered cattle removed from some allotments. The experience burned the Becks and others as permanently as a brand. "We realized just how precarious our position is," says Beck.

Bob Doppelt, PRC's general counsel, defends the suit: "We were only trying to get the Forest Service to do a good job. They were allowing timber sales without consulting with the National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS]." PRC's suit charged that the Forest Service violated the Endangered Species Act by failing to consult with NMFS on its overall 1990 forest plan. Instead, the Forest Service checked with NMFS before approving individual projects—logging, road repairs or whatever. Last month, the Supreme Court agreed with PRC that the Endangered Species Act requires more than a project-by-project consultation.

The Forest Service, meantime, has completed the consultation in question—but under the Endangered Species Act, which requires the loser to pay the costs of lawsuits, it must reimburse the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund for the costs of its legal fight on behalf of PRC. To say the Forest Service must foot the bill, of course, is another way of saying that the taxpayer must. Though the amount for this case is not established, the group has received "about \$2 million" in attorneys' fees from the federal government in the past two years, says Buck Parker, a defense fund vice president.

The fight cost Oregon public-lands ranchers \$39,000 in legal fees. Since the Forest Service completed the consultation sought by PRC before the lawsuit was even decided, "All it did was cost the government and us a lot of money," says Beck.

Sharon and Bob Beck have a stake in what happens here. Their cow-calf operation lies in this nearly flat 150,000-acre valley, which is planted to grass and crops as diverse as coriander and sugar beets. The whole is surrounded by mountains. While water is abundant in spring, this is high country some 2,500' above sea level. Pastures can become parched in summer, so cattle are moved to the forest in May.

"To us the land is everything. It is our connection with our history and our connection with our future," Sharon Beck says.

Bob's great-grandfather led a wagon train to western Oregon. Sharon was born here, surrounded by reminders of her ancestors. The front door is Carolina poplar, the tree Sharon's grandmother nurtured with left-over wash water. With their two daughters grown and gone and son Rob farming 14 crops on hundreds of acres of arable land, Bob handles the cattle while Sharon delves ever deeper into the tangled web of local environmental group financing.

Teamed with Oregon Cattlemen's Association attorney Lindsay Slater, she discovered that PRC was receiving grant money from

the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF). Indeed, 75% of PRC's funding in 1994 came not from individuals but foundations. What's unique about NFWF among foundations, though, is that a third of its funding—millions of dollars—comes from taxpayers (see sidebar).

Slater lays out the irony neatly: "Here was a foundation giving taxpayer dollars to a group that then turned around and sued the federal government."

Slater obtained a list of all NFWF grants made to groups in Oregon since 1988—\$9.3 million worth. While NFWF staff prepared to come to Oregon to meet with the cattlemen, Sharon Beck spotted two troublesome grants.

The first was a \$180,000 grant to PRC for a project dubbed "Salmon Safe." Though this grant had nothing to do with the earlier lawsuit, it was not lost on Beck and Slater that such funding keeps PRC flush, enabling it to pursue litigation.

Just as bad, the Salmon Safe project seemed unnecessary. The idea was to create a green label for ranches that participate in PRC projects to improve riparian habitat. But the Oregon Cattlemen's Association routinely conducts watershed workshops with university scientists who bring cattlemen the latest in riparian and range management. "NFWF just throws the money out there and never looks back," says Beck. At the meeting with NFWF staff in January, the cattlemen convinced them the project couldn't fly.

"The Pacific Rivers lawsuit took us by surprise," admits NFWF's Krishna Roy. "It is not something where we would necessarily have turned down the grant if we'd known they were suing someone else, but we have to keep it in mind in determining whether a project can be successful." The federal portion of the grant, \$60,000, has been frozen.

"We contacted PRC," Roy says, "and said, Look, we are not going to dispense any federal funds until we are satisfied that private landowners are willing to participate in this program and that it can work."

PRC isn't worried. Doppelt says, "Whether NFWF gives us money or not, it won't stop us." Cattlemen need "to get real. It's a sad thing to see them spin their wheels and look for scapegoats. The world has fundamentally changed and they don't like it."

The second grant that caught Sharon Beck's eye was to another local group suing ranchers: Water Watch of Oregon, Inc. In 1992, NFWF gave the group \$201,674, \$62,903 of it federal funds. The money "supported" an effort to remove the Savage Rapids Dam on the Rogue River. The turn-of-the-century dam supplies irrigation water and recreation and recharges wells. Sharon Beck initially thought the grant might be a positive example of NFWF's work—but then she talked to local people like Jack Waldon, who runs a small newspaper, *The Little Company*.

"This isn't about saving the salmon, it's about who controls the water," says Waldon. "Taking the dam out will affect people's water rights. If they were worried about the salmon, the town would stop using the Rogue River for sewage treated with chlorine."

Attorney later checked out Water Watch and confirmed that it has objected to every proposed water right in Oregon. Fighting these objections costs farmers and ranchers time and money.

NFWF's Whit Fosburgh argues the grant is justified: "The dam's a big fish killer and it's going to be a tremendous expense to bring it up to specifications," he says. But spring chinook salmon runs on the Rogue are 25%

larger than they were a year ago, according to the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Department.

"I went back 30 years, and I couldn't find a higher count at this time," says district biologist Mike Evenson.

As for the argument that fixing the dam would be hugely expensive—the federal government says it would cost millions—Emerson Roller, a contractor for 45 years who lives in the area, says the fish ladders on the dam could be repaired for \$100,000. "It needs maintenance. If they use common sense they can probably fix it for less."

"Why not use NFWF's money to fix the ladders?" asked Waldon, who by now believes the effort to take down the dam is tinged with conspiracy.

"NFWF never came to Oregon before making the grant," says Sharon Beck. "They never talked to anyone in the community. They just gave them the money to take out the dam. There is no accountability."

Well, there wasn't—but now there is. As a result of Slater's deft work and some pressure from the district's Rep. Wes Cooley (R-Ore.) and Idaho's Rep. Helen Chenoweth (R), NFWF has been responsive indeed. It will now ask grant applicants if they are parties to litigation, and allow the Oregon Cattlemen's Association to review grant applications for projects in the state. Other states can make the same request.

Nevertheless, Chenoweth wants all federal funding for NFWF ended. Other members of Congress are reluctant to go that far, but with pressure to cut the deficit building, the President's request for NFWF federal funding of \$7.5 million may be in jeopardy. It certainly wouldn't break the environmental movement: In 1992, 379 foundations gave \$356 million to environmental and animal causes. Because of the federal funding it receives, NFWF is not included in this count. It is considered a "public" charity.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 1, 1995]

NON-PROFIT GROUPS' FUNDS UNDER FIRE

(By Patricia Peak Klintberg)

COVE, ORE.—What really galled Sharon Beck was when she learned that her tax dollars were hard at work. Against her.

She and her husband, Bob, raised cattle in the Grande Ronde Valley. While their cattle graze at the ranch in spring, they are moved to public forest land during the summer's dry months.

A year ago, a local environmental group went to court to protect endangered salmon, and that action almost forced the Becks' cattle off the forest land.

What the Becks didn't find out until later was that their own tax dollars partly funded the group.

Their experience is not unique. Thousands of non-profit groups that receive taxpayer funds lobby and participate in litigation. So common is the practice that freshman Rep. David McIntosh (R-Ind.) held a congressional hearing this week to investigate.

Some 600,000 non-profits or charities, ranging from hospitals to cultural centers, received \$159 billion in federal funds in 1992, according to Independent Sector, a coalition of 800 non-profits.

McIntosh says he is interested in all non-profits that use taxpayer dollars to lobby and litigate on the local or national level.

"Whether it's the Nature Conservancy on the left or local Chambers of Commerce on the right, if special interest are using taxpayer money to lobby for more money, it's just plain wrong," said McIntosh, chairman of the House regulatory affairs subcommittee.

Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.) accused McIntosh of engaging in a "systematic effort to silence voices that disagree with the new Republican majority."

McIntosh replied: "We are not trying to silence them. We are just not going to give them taxpayer money to exercise their free-speech rights."

Among his targets is the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, the group the Becks discovered was helping fund local environmental groups in Oregon.

Congress created the foundation in 1984 to finance public and private partnerships for conservation projects. It is authorized to receive \$25 million a year in federal funds, although appropriations have never exceeded \$10 million in a year.

The federal money is given as a "challenge" grant, which means private contributions must match the federal portion of the grant.

The foundation is barred by law from lobbying. Yet in a letter last March, its deputy director, Barbara Cairns, asked board members to contact certain members of Congress to save the National Biological Service from budget cuts.

It also is barred from litigating. But according to Lindsay Slater, an attorney for the Oregon Cattlemen's Association, it has given grants to groups that do.

While environmental groups are a particular target of congressional budget cutters, they are not the only non-profits that lobby and litigate while receiving taxpayer dollars. The American Bar Association received \$9.5 million in federal funds in 1992. Local Chambers of Commerce received \$2 million over the past two years.

The lawsuit that threatened to disrupt the Becks' cattle operation was brought by the Eugene-based Pacific Rivers Council, which received a \$160,000 grant from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, \$60,000 of that from taxpayer money.

The suit charged that the Forest Service violated the law because it failed to consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service on its overall forest management plan. Instead, the Forest Service had been checking with the agency before approving individual projects, such as logging or road repair.

In May, the Supreme Court upheld the decision of a lower court, agreeing that the Endangered Species Act requires more of the Forest Service than a project-by-project consultation.

In the end, the Becks' cattle were able to remain in the forest. But the Becks and other Oregon ranchers whose cattle graze on public land had to lay out \$39,000 in legal fees to fight the injunction.

The Becks are further angered that, as taxpayers they must also help foot the legal bills of the Pacific River Council: The council's legal team will be reimbursed by taxpayers because the Endangered Species Act requires losers—in this case, the Forest Service—to pay.

Said Slater: "Here was a foundation giving taxpayer dollars to a group that then turned around and sued the federal government."

The foundation grant to the Pacific Rivers Council was for a project that was unrelated to the lawsuit. But it helped keep the council "flush" so it could pursue litigation, Slater said.

"The PRC lawsuit took us by surprise," admitted Krishna Roy of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. It is not something where we would necessarily have turned down the grant if we'd known they were suing someone, but we have to keep it in

mind in determining whether a project can be successful."

The foundation has since agreed to ask grant applicants if they are parties to litigation, and it will allow the Oregon Cattlemen's Association to review grant applications for projects in the state.

But the Interior Department appropriations bill approved by a House panel Tuesday cuts the foundation's funds to \$4 million in fiscal 1996 and recommends eliminating it altogether in 1997.

House Resources Committee Chairman Don Young (R-Alaska) said he has supported the Fish and Wildlife Foundation in the past, "but they ought to be spending their money on wildlife projects, not funding our adversaries."

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 18, 1995]

WHY ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDING IS FOREVER

(By Alston Chase)

If you've wondered why it's so hard to reduce government spending, consider this: The whole country is on the dole. The poor have welfare. The middle class has college loans and National Public Radio. And the truly affluent enjoys handouts too. These are called "environmental," but you can think of them as pork.

This is worth keeping in mind as we watch Republicans try to reform preservation policy. GOP bean-counters promise to make welfare mothers and Sesame Streeters work for a living. Federal monies to both should be scrapped, they insist, because welfare doesn't work and public broadcasting does. One wastes public money, and the other can do without it.

But while many preservation programs are both wasteful and redundant, congressional cheese-parers have left them alone. And the reason isn't hard to find: The bureaucrats who run preservation agencies are smarter than their Hill adversaries. They know that merely speaking the magic words "private enterprise" reduces the most frugal GOP lawmaking to an oozing puddle of acquiescence.

Ever since the November Republican landslide, Beltway empire builders have been heavily playing this card. Quicker than you can say "Enola Gay," they have switched political sides, magically remaking their images from collectivist ecosystem groupies into staunch free-market libertarians. And conservatives are falling for it.

Such, for example, is the tactic of an upper-class entitlement called the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. This organization is authorized to spend up to \$25 million in federal funds a year, which it funnels to environmental advocacy groups and upscale hunting and fishing organizations. But its executive director, Amos Eno, a former National Audubon Society staffer, has convinced conservatives that this effort is a bastion of the free market. Last month, *Forbes* magazine praised the Foundation, urging that "other environmental groups would do well to adopt a down-to-earth, Eno-like approach."

To be sure, other conservation organizations, such as the Sierra Club, that are experiencing financial problems, would do better on the public dole, too. The Foundation reveals why public subsidies are forever. Established by Congress during the heyday of

trickle-down economics in 1984, its purpose was to raise private monies for federal and private preservation causes. Originally, it was expected to become self-supporting. Government, Congress then supposed, would only provide the seed money to get it started. To this end, it promised to match, one for one, each dollar the Foundation raised from private sources, up to \$1 million.

This federal commitment of course, was entirely unnecessary. America has plenty of philanthropies and doesn't need another. By 1993, according to the Environmental Data Institute, there were more than 1,800 environmental grantmakers, which since 1988 made more than 22,000 grants. Just the top 417 of these givers have combined assets totaling more than \$110 billion and collectively award more than \$340 million to recipients each year.

Nevertheless, the foundation's "private fund-raising" idea jerked the right chains of congresspeople infatuated with free enterprise. In 1987, the cap on federal matching funds was raised to \$5 million and, in 1994, lifted again to \$25 million annually for the next five years. In 1993, 31 percent of the Foundation's \$17.9 million in revenues came from taxpayers.

Meanwhile, the foundation befriended the power elite. It put, on its Board of Directors and Advisory Committee, people like Caroline Getty, James A. Baker IV, Marshall Field and Nancy N. Weyerhaeuser. It made grants to the favorite environmental and sporting causes of the rich, such as the National Audubon Society, Nature Conservancy, Natural Resources Defense Council, National Wildlife Federation, Ducks Unlimited and Trout Unlimited. It bestowed stipends on individuals, too. In 1992, according to the Environmental Data Institute, it awarded one Rick Weyerhaeuser \$80,000 to write a book on the environment.

And according to insiders, such disbursements escape adequate oversight. Taking place in the noman's land between public and private sectors, they are not subject to the same accountability other federal programs are. Complaining of a lack of sufficient "scrutiny" of grants awarded, in 1992, one board member noted, "staff review . . . seems to tend toward advocacy rather than critical review."

Despite these concerns, the Foundation, with friends in high places, remains insulated from budget cutters. A former Foundation staffer now works for the House Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations. And when the subcommittee staff recently discusses possible cuts to the Foundation budget, word reportedly got back to Mr. Eno, who, according to sources, then visited the Hill to convince lawmakers of the Foundation's conservative bona fides.

Thus, while Republicans pick on "Masterpiece Theatre," they leave rarefied precincts of preservation alone. This is too bad. If public broadcasting should be weaned from the federal teat because it can survive without aid, so should silver-spooned enclaves like the Foundation. But this probably won't happen. Like all bad environmentalism, its support is bipartisan.

RAMPANT ANTI-SEMITISM IN INDONESIA—ISRAELI ARCHERY TEAM NOT PERMITTED TO COMPETE UNDER ISRAEL'S FLAG

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I was outraged, appalled, and dismayed—but unfortunately not surprised—by the latest case of blatant anti-Semitism in Indonesia.

The facts of the case are appalling. The world archery championships are to be held in Jakarta, Indonesia, on August 1–6 of this year. The Indonesian officials organizing the event refused to permit the team representing Israel to participate under the name of the country of Israel and under the Israeli flag. The Indonesian organizing officials proposed that the Israeli archery team be designated group A, that it march at the opening and closing ceremonies under the flag of the International Archery Federation [FITA], and, if an Israeli archer wins a medal, the Indonesian officials want the fanfare of the FITA to be played instead of the national anthem of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, this request from Indonesian officials is both ludicrous and outrageous. Israel is a sovereign nation, a member of the United Nations, and is recognized by most countries. Indonesia, as a matter of policy, does not have diplomatic relations with Israel, and that, I am certain, is a clear reflection of the reason these Indonesian officials have taken such an offensive racist, anti-Semitic and anti-Israel position.

Unfortunately, this is not the first instance of such intolerance. When the film "Schindler's List" was produced a few years ago by Stephen Spielberg, Indonesia was one of the few countries on the face of the Earth which refused to permit the movie to be shown. I intervened with the Indonesian Ambassador and I am delighted to report that eventually the movie was screened in Indonesia.

A year or so ago, I also raised with the Indonesian Ambassador and discussed in a hearing of the House Foreign Affairs Committee the publication in Indonesia's leading English-language newspaper, the *Indonesia Times*, an article by Prof. Agha Hamid, which was one of the most vicious anti-Semitic diatribes that I have seen, and I have seen a great deal of vicious anti-Semitism. Just one sample: "Actually the Jewish religion is not a religion at all. It is infact [sic.] a bloody, sadistic and obscene code devised by Zionist-Talmudist sages." And further: "The Jewish sages were not exclusively interested in homicide. Sexuality, particularly in far lesser conventional modes, is a strong rival for their attention." The Indonesian Government at that time knew of my outrage over the publication of such disgusting trash.

Mr. Speaker, in light of this latest intolerable action by Indonesian officials organizing the world archery competition against the citizens of a sovereign, independent country, I have introduced a resolution which puts the Congress

on record as opposing the effort to deny recognition to the State of Israel and its citizens and reaffirming the Congress' strong opposition to racism and anti-Semitism. This resolution calls upon the Indonesian Government to act to end this outrageous anti-Israeli action. I invite my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of this resolution.

The Text of my resolution is as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. LANTOS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations.

A resolution condemning the refusal of the Indonesian officials organizing the World Archery Championships in Jakarta, Indonesia, in August 1995 to permit a team from Israel to participate in the competition under the name of Israel and under the flag of Israel, and urging the government of Indonesia to join in condemning this manifestation of racism and anti-Semitism.

Whereas the Congress has repeatedly expressed its abhorrence of racism and anti-Semitism in any form;

Whereas the constitution of the International Archery Federation (FITA) bars discrimination against any country, association or person on grounds of race, religion or politics;

Whereas Indonesian officials organizing the World Archery Championships in Jakarta, Indonesia, in August 1995 have refused to permit a team representing Israel to participate in the competition unless the team agrees to conceal its national identity and not compete under the flag of Israel; and

Whereas officials of the International Archery Federation (FITA) have confirmed that Indonesian officials have refused to permit an Israeli team to participate under its country's name and with its country's flag in the World Archery Championships; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress:

(1) Condemns the Indonesian offices organizing the World Archery Championships in Jakarta, Indonesia, for this refusal to permit a team representing Israel to participate in this international competition under the name and flag of their country;

(2) Calls upon the Government of Indonesia to repudiate publicly the position that has been taken by those Indonesian officials organizing the World Archery Championships in Jakarta regarding the participation of a team representing Israel in the competition and to urge the inclusion of the team of Israel under the name of Israel and under the flag of Israel;

(3) Condemns all manifestations of racism and anti-Semitism wherever they may appear in Indonesia and elsewhere throughout the world; and

(4) Directs and Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate to convey a copy of this resolution to the President of Indonesia and to the President of the International Archery Federation (FITA).

ON THE PASSING OF GEORGE L.P. WEAVER

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention the following obituary for George L.P. Weaver which appeared in the July 18, 1995 issue of the Washington Post. With the passing of George Weaver, the country has lost a great American—one who dedicated himself to ensuring equal opportunity and justice for all Americans. The principles for which George Weaver dedicated his life—an abiding respect for the dignity of workers and the worth of labor and an unshakable commitment to ending the scourge of segregation and racism—both in his service to the labor movement and in his work in Government, are the principles that have served to make this country what it is today. This House turns its back on those principles at its own and the Nation's peril.

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 1995]
GEORGE L.P. WEAVER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR

George L.P. Weaver, 83, a former labor union official who served as assistant secretary of labor for international affairs during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, died July 14, of complications related to emphysema and asthma at George Washington University Hospital.

Mr. Weaver spent most of his working life in activities related to the labor movement, beginning in the 1930s when he carried passengers' baggage as a redcap at railroad stations in Chicago. As a young man, he joined the United Transport Service Employees Union.

Later, he was assistant to the secretary-treasurer and director of the civil rights committee of the old Congress of Industrial Organizations. After the CIO's merger with the American Federation of Labor in 1955, he became executive secretary of the new union's civil rights committee.

In his capacity as assistant secretary of labor for international affairs, Mr. Weaver was the U.S. representative on the governing body of the International Labor Organization. He was chairman of that body in 1968. After stepping down as assistant secretary of labor in 1969, he was assistant to the president of the ILO for about six years.

Mr. Weaver, a Washington resident, was born in Pittsburgh and grew up in Dayton, Ohio. He attended what now in Roosevelt University in Chicago and Howard University law school.

In 1941, he came to Washington as a member of the CIO's War Relief Committee. A year later, he became assistant to the secretary-treasurer and director of the civil rights committee. During the next dozen years, he took leaves of absence to serve on special government assignments and on overseas missions. The assignments included service in 1950 as special assistant to Stuart Symington, chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and assisting in the reorganization of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

He participated in investigations of labor conditions in various Asian countries for the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

In 1958, Mr. Weaver resigned from the AFL-CIO to become assistant to the president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers and director of the union's political education program. He remained in that job until joining the Labor Department in the Kennedy administration.

In 1963, he was the first American to receive the Malayan honorary award of Panglim Mangku Megara. He had served on the boards of trustees of Washington Technical Institution and the University of the District of Columbia, was chairman of the Finance Committee of the United Negro College Fund and was a life member of the NAACP.

Survivors include his wife of 54 years, Mary S. Weaver of Washington, and two sisters, Vivian Belden of Detroit and Annalouise Jenkins of Cleveland.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. JAMES J. CRAVENS, JR.

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man that has served as Commanding General at Fort Bliss, TX for the past 2 years with distinction, Maj. Gen. James J. Cravens, Jr. He is highly regarded as an outstanding leader, and maintained Fort Bliss' reputation as a good neighbor to El Paso.

General Cravens has served his country since 1966 when he was commissioned a Second Lieutenant of Artillery upon graduation from North Georgia College where he received a bachelor of science degree in business administration. He also holds a master of science degree from Clemson University.

His military education includes the Air Defense Artillery Officers Basic Course, the Air Defense Artillery Officer's Advanced Course, the Army Command and General Staff College, and the National War College.

General Cravens' military decorations and awards include the Legion of Merit (with two Oak Leaf Clusters), Bronze Star Medal (with Oak Leaf Cluster), Meritorious Service Medal (with four Oak Leaf Clusters), Army Commendation Medal (with Oak Leaf Cluster), Parachutist Badge, Pathfinder Badge, and Army Staff Identification Badge.

As Commanding General of the Air Defense Artillery Center at Fort Bliss, General Cravens has overseen the instruction of air defense artillery students from all over the world. The ADA School trains air defenders, develops air defense doctrine, and defines air defense equipment requirements. As you know, Mr. Speaker, some of the school's graduates distinguished themselves operating the Patriot Missile during Operation Desert Storm when the allied forces fought off various SCUD missile attacks from the country of Iraq.

When James Cravens assumed his command at Fort Bliss, I found him to be a man of integrity and great talent. He quickly captured the affection of El Pasoans with his unyielding quest to produce the finest air defense specialists in the world. The overwhelming skill and superiority that our air defense forces displayed in Operation Desert Storm is due in large part to the intense training they received at the ADA School at Fort Bliss.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish my friend, James Cravens, all the best as he prepares to assume his next assignment as Deputy Chief of Staff for Combat Development at Fort Monroe, VA. It has been a pleasure to work with General Cravens to ensure that Fort Bliss continues to live up to its motto, "First to Fire." General Cravens, his lovely wife, Joe Beth, and his children, Jay and Tonya, will be sorely missed.

RETIRING? NOT EXACTLY

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, when Bill Breisky announced recently his decision to step down from the helm of the Cape Cod Times, the newspaper launched a national search for a new editor. The advertisement sought—and, in case any Member of this House is interested, is still seeking—candidates with a "proven track record of staff motivation, community leadership, innovative product improvements, a bias toward strong local news coverage, a belief in the principles of public journalism, and a respect for the budget. Our 72-person staff is highly talented and has won a barrel full of excellence awards. No "now hear this candidates need apply."

It is hard to imagine a more fitting tribute to the standard and example set over the last 17 years by Mr. Breisky. A daily reporter at heart, Bill would nonetheless hold a story to ensure its accuracy. He cares far less about journalistic conventions like political box scores, than reporting how we on the cape and islands—as a geographic community and as what he calls "communities of interest"—actually conduct our business.

Bill has grappled thoughtfully with the high, often irreconcilable expectations of Times readers—not to mention those of its editorial staff, or of people whose activities we read about in the paper. We sometimes seek all things from our local paper, from the House floor to our back yard. Beyond the hour-by-hour crises and judgments that on into making sure the paper actually hits the street each day, there are important questions about the future of the industry. The traffic on the information superhighway is increasing as fast as the price of newsprint.

About this and other things, Bill Breisky actually sits back, puts aside the crisis of the moment—and reflects. He set out in 1978 to

do better than parochial, stenographic reporting, and got as passionate as deadlines permit about looking at the bigger picture. As an editor, he inaugurated "Cape Cod Agenda" to sort out the real impact of development on the cape and islands. As a citizen, he has worked through the Center for the Environment and Sustainable Development to pursue the twin—and, notwithstanding the nay sayers, the compatible—objectives of economic development and environmental protection.

You do not get that from a sleepy country editor, any more than from a cigar-chomping Lou Grant. As Adlai Stevenson once said, "Via ovicupitum dura est"—"the way of the egghead is hard." It will surprise no one that this was in a speech to Harvard students. Or that they needed to have it translated.

With a steady rudder, an even keel and numerous other maritime metaphors, Bill has guided the Times through these shoals with dignity, professionalism, compassion, and humor. He must have even overcome that highest of all hurdles, since I have not heard anyone ask recently how many generations ago his family settled on Cape Cod. In the process, he has earned the affection and respect of the community he's worked so hard to define.

And in case you were wondering—and let us hope that the various editors who may be interested were wondering—yes, Editor and Publisher does think the word barrelful has three L's. The way this session of Congress is going, resolving that question may require another amendment to the Constitution.

In spirit, and in preparation for festivities at home this weekend in Mr. Breisky's honor, it is my privilege to enter into the RECORD his "Centerpiece" column of July 2, 1995—entitled "Retiring? Not Exactly"—in which Bill made official his graduation to emeritus status.

[From the Cape Cod Times, July 2, 1995]

RETIRING?—NOT EXACTLY

(By William J. Breisky)

Seventeen years ago, I assumed the editorship of the Cape Cod Times, and inaugurated a column entitled "Another Monday." It ran in place of the second Monday editorial, and was meant to serve as something of an antidote to the unpleasant surprises so often in store for us on a typical Monday morning.

In the six years that I managed to meet my self-imposed deadline for "Another Monday," I never succeeded in finding writing time at the office, and the task became, all too often, a Sunday-evening stress test. So I declared a sabbatical.

Part of the reason I never got around to returning from that sabbatical was a gentlewoman who approached me regularly during the coffee hour that followed our Sunday-morning church service. For two years' worth of Sundays after "Another Monday" had vanished, this charming and faithful reader assured me, week after week, "I love your column. Never miss it."

That was reassuring.

Well, this is a long-winded introduction to the fact that tomorrow will be anything but

"another Monday" in my professional life. It will be the first Monday in more than 17 years that I will not be contemplating my responsibilities as editor of the Times.

Tomorrow I will assume the Title of "editor emeritus"—which means I will begin fishing through 17 years' accumulation of office files and clutter, to make room for the lucky individual who soon will be elected to occupy my chair. It also means that while I will continue to sit on the Times editorial board, our newsroom staff will be free to dismiss my notions concerning what is, or isn't, newsworthy.

Our readers, on the other hand, will not get off the hook so easily.

For the next few months at least, I will be spending a portion of my time at something we in the trade have come to refer to as "public journalism," a major part of which involves listening more closely to readers.

To journalists who are captivated by the idea, public journalism generally means finding new ways to involve readers in their newspapers, and to involve newspapers in the communities they serve—reporting on the issues of the day as they are seen by the people who live here, rather than relying on elected officials and the bureaucracy.

To some skeptical editors who are less than enchanted with the concept, public journalism means handing the reins over to amateurs—and trading objectivity and detachment for reader chumminess.

There is no prescribed formula for the practice of public journalism, however, and there's no reason why common sense shouldn't prevail in applying it.

When great numbers of readers take a proprietary interest in the Times—when they call us to applaud or criticize "my newspaper," and when people who work here take the position that public service is their primary mission—we're surely on the right track.

Letters to the Editor, and a range of opinion columns by writers who live in our towns, and our "Sound Off" feature, and our Earthkeeping Forum, and our Cape Cod Times Needy Fund, and the volunteers in Journalism group recently established by members of our news staff—all are aspects of what I think of as public journalism.

But we can and should be doing more.

Last year's "Cape Cod Agenda" project was our most thoroughgoing effort at inviting the public to tell us and their political representatives where we should be focusing our attention. In order to help persuade November's batch of candidates to focus on issues that matter, we asked members of our Citizens Election Panel—a diverse panel of public-minded citizens chosen for us from a pool of volunteers by the League of Women Voters—to cite the local and regional issues most important to them. Then we invited readers to narrow the panel's two dozen issues, to six, and we declared those issues to constitute the "Cap Cod Agenda."

Agenda issues were debated by candidates—and discussed at length at a series of programs where the citizenry did most of the talking and the candidates came primarily to listen.

This fall the Times will again invite you and your neighbors to set an agenda for Cape

Cod, and to talk to use and each other about things that matter individually and collectively. The agenda format may change this year, but the objective will be the same—encouraging community leaders, and the Times itself, to do a better job of serving our community of readers.

Do you think we're on the right track?

Would you like to be involved in one way or another? A postcard or letter to Agenda '95, Cape Cod Times, 319 Main Street, Hyannis, MA 02601, will get my attention and will assure you a seat on the train.

Welcome aboard.

And while I have your attention, I would like to go on record with a couple of concluding observations.

First, I'd like to say that serving as editor of the daily newspaper that serves this remarkable corner of America has been more fun than a barrel of cranberries. (Well, most days.) That has been so because I've had the privilege of working with a wondrous crew of talented, steadfast journalists who care deeply about their world and their chosen profession.

And second—to the legions of friends and acquaintances who greet me these days with the words, "I hear you're retiring," I would like to say:

You've got to be kidding! My wife's got 17 years' worth of untended chores saved up as retirement projects.

I'm not the retiring type. It's just that someone else deserves a turn at this nifty job I've had.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICE OF KOREAN WAR VETERANS

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today our Nations honors the many soldiers who fought in the forgotten war in Korea by dedicating the Korean War Veterans Memorial on the Mall. This Memorial is a tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by all the men and women who served.

Near the entrance to the memorial, an inscription reads, "Our Nation Honors Her Sons and Daughters Who Answered the Call to Defend a Country They Did Not Know and People They Had Never Met." The bravery of these Korean War veterans is inscribed in our history. They served our country in places like the Chosin Reservoir, Inchon, and Pusan. Some who went and fought did not come home, but made the ultimate sacrifice. In fact, some 54,000 Americans lost their lives. Others who served experienced events that changed their lives forever.

In Korea, United States soldiers fought in a United Nations force alongside soldiers from all over the world. As part of this multinational force, some 114,000 men and women from Minnesota answered the call to serve. Minnesotans served in all branches of our military

service and they served with honor and distinction. Six hundred and eighty-eight Minnesotans were killed in action.

Because of their sacrifices and those of other United Nations Troops, the Republic of Korea's freedom was preserved. Over the past 42 years, the Republic of Korea has emerged from the ruins of the war and has built one of the most successful economies in Asia.

The Korean War Veterans Memorial will be a permanent reminder for visitors to our Capital of the American soldiers who served in a difficult and costly war in Korea. As a Member from the State of Minnesota, I am proud to say that the cutting, etching, and polishing of the soldiers' faces on the granite of the memorial was done in our State at Cold Spring, Minnesota.

The memorial on the Mall is a testament to the sacrifices of the soldiers who fought and to those who never made it home. It is also a testament to those veterans who vowed never to forget their comrades. It was through their efforts that this memorial was built, I was proud to have a role in supporting and helping guide the policy and laws that facilitated this Korean War Veterans Memorial.

I join with all Americans in proudly saluting the bravery and service of America's Korean War veterans.

TRIBUTE TO KOREA VETERANS

HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember an important chapter in American history. It was not long ago that American soldiers were fighting in the name of democracy on the shores of Korea. While it is necessary to put those days behind us, it is also important not to lose sight of the tremendous acts of courage by our Armed Forces that are responsible for this new cordial period.

Today, here in our Nation's Capital, we will honor the men and women who gallantly served our country in the Korean war. Across from the Vietnam Memorial and in the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial, the Korean War Memorial will stand in the company of the most celebrated monuments in the Nation. It is a tribute to all those brave men and women who donned a U.S. military uniform, including those who lost their lives and those still missing. As Americans, we are indebted to the soldiers who placed their own lives on the line in order to protect the cornerstones of American freedom. They fought to protect the freedom to speak without the fear of Government censorship. They fought for the freedom to freely worship any religion without fear of retribution. All in all, they fought for the very principles that our Founding Fathers wrote into the four corners of the Constitution.

In an era that is often assumed to be bereft of leaders, we overlook these true American

heroes. As a nation, we must ensure that those who have honorably served and died in our Armed Forces are remembered with gratitude. The decision to serve this country was a selfless act not only to protect the future of the United States, but the beliefs on which we founded our Nation. When the country called, these courageous young soldiers stared fear in the face and accepted the challenge no matter the cost. They embody the traits that we, as a nation, should all strive to emulate.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we all bow our heads in remembrance of the valiant young men and women who have pledged to protect the principles of freedom that we as Americans, cherish as no other nation on Earth.

THE FOURTH ANNUAL OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to serve as a member of the U.S. delegation to the recently concluded 4th annual meeting of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, held in Ottawa from July 4-8. Our delegation was co-chaired by Helsinki Commission ranking member, STENY H. HOYER and Representative MICHAEL P. FORBES, and included our colleagues, LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER, ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, RONALD D. COLEMAN and THOMAS C. SAWYER.

The Parliamentary Assembly, created as a result of the United States initiative during the Bush administration, is designed to help integrate newly independent countries and emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union into western-style organizations. Through the Assembly, those responsible for crafting the laws which implement civic and economic reforms in the new democracies have the opportunity to share their experiences with, and gain advice from, parliamentarians from established democracies. Participation by parliamentarians from the reforming countries was strong in Ottawa. Forty seven of OSCE's 52 fully participating States were represented in Ottawa, as well as observers from Macedonia and Japan. Due to the continuing siege of Sarajevo, parliamentarians from Bosnia-Herzegovina were unable to attend. Their Ambassador to the OSCE was present, however, and at his request, I was pleased to make a statement on behalf of the people of Bosnia during the closing plenary session.

Mr. Speaker, in his statement to the Assembly during the closing plenary session Mr. HOYER reminded us that August 1, 1995 marks the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act. In that speech Mr. HOYER recalled the words of President Gerald Ford upon the signing of the historic accord—"This document will not be measured by the promises made in the Helsinki Final Act, but by the promises kept."

The tragic overrunning of Srebrenica and Zepa by the Bosnian Serbs, and the creation

of thousands of more victims of war crimes perpetrated by the Serb aggressors is a searing reminder to all of us that there are promises to be kept. I agree wholeheartedly with my friend and colleague STENY HOYER that we can, and must, do more. I commend to you his remarks:

STATEMENT OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE STENY HOYER, 4TH ANNUAL SESSION OF THE OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY.

July 8, 1995.

President Swaen, Officers of the Assembly, fellow delegates: In twenty-three days, on August 1, 1995, we will celebrate the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act. That date also holds significant personal interest for me because, ten years ago, as a new member of the U.S. Helsinki Commission, I attended my first OSCE meeting—a Conference on the Human Dimension—here in Ottawa.

When President Gerald Ford signed the historic accord in Helsinki on behalf of the United States he said, "This document will not be measured by the promises made in the Helsinki Final Act, but by the promises kept."

Many signatory states viewed the words of the act dealing with human rights and the obligations that each state had toward its own citizens, as well as those of other states, as essentially meaningless window dressing. Their objective was to secure a framework in which their international political position, and the then existing map of Europe would be adjudged a fait accompli.

Ten years ago, when I came to the Helsinki meeting in Ottawa, I was told by my Soviet counterparts that the discussion of the rights of Soviet citizens was inappropriate, and an interference with their internal affairs. My delegation rejected that rationale. Words, we strongly maintained, were not enough. Words are not enough today.

The relevance of this organization or any international organization must be judged not solely on the merits of its principles, but on the strength of its commitment to those principles and on its unwillingness to witness or permit violation of those principles by signatory state.

The Helsinki Final Act, like the United Nations Charter, was an attempt to avoid the egregious mistakes of the past which had allowed so much human suffering and carnage. A history which witnessed too often the rationalization of inaction.

President George Bush, in assessing the end of the cold war and the fall of the Berlin Wall, called for a "New World Order" in which the international community would act in order to assure a global political environment dependent upon right not might.

Today we are confronted within the Helsinki sphere by the actions of those adjudged by my government, as well as by many of yours, to be war criminals. Actions which have repeated genocide on the European continent, and created the largest number of refugees on that continent since the second world war.

We have in past meetings condemned these atrocities. As parliamentarians we have urged that such actions be stopped. And many of our members have committed people and resources to relieve the suffering and

stop the criminal behavior. But we have not yet succeeded. And we must, therefore, do more.

I believe this organization can be an important instrument in realizing a world order based upon law and the principles of the final Act. I, and the members of my delegation, pledge to you our every effort to ensure the full participation of the United States Congress as a partner in the vital quest to ensure that history's judgement of the Parliamentary Assembly, and the OSCE, is that our words of principle were supported by our decisive and effective actions.

It is said in America that many can "talk the talk," but only a few are prepared to "walk the walk." The tyrants and terrorists of our world are not dissuaded or intimidated by talk. But they can and must be confronted and confounded by our walk. I believe together we can see the realization of a new world order.

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNAL

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, I hail the indictments issued this week by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. The number of indictments has now grown to 46; more significantly, they now include the infamous names of Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic, the highest ranking political and military leaders among the Bosnian Serb hierarchy in Pale. With their indictment, Chief Prosecutor Richard Goldstone has proven himself a man of his word. Upon his appointment in July 1994, Goldstone promised to take his prosecution where the evidence leads and to bring the most culpable—those who order and enable others to commit atrocities—within the reach of the court. In so doing, his indictments bring us one step closer to holding those responsible for the orchestration of the most egregious crimes of the Yugoslav War personally responsible for their actions.

To further advance the work of this Court, the United States should take two key measures. First, the United States must ensure that the Tribunal has the financial resources to bring these cases to trial and continue with effective investigations and prosecutions. Although last year, during a period of initial startup, the United States made a \$3 million voluntary contribution to the Tribunal, a subsequent voluntary contribution has not been forthcoming. Failure by the United States to provide adequate financial support to the Tribunal—at the very time the Tribunal's initial investigations are producing meaningful results—would send a regrettable sign of weakening U.S. resolve to see war criminals held truly accountable. If the Administration will not take the lead, Congress should earmark appropriations for the Voluntary Fund for the Tribunal, consistent with the authorization in H.R. 1561.

Second, President Clinton should, once and for all, put to rest the notion that amnesty or

immunity is a viable option for the architects of ethnic cleansing and those charged with genocide; the continued silence of top U.S. officials on this matter undermines confidence in the U.S. commitment to hold such individuals personally accountable. In addition, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Madeleine Albright, should publicly state American resolve to use our veto, if necessary, to ensure that sanctions against Serbia remain in place until Belgrade cooperates with the Tribunal by surrendering to the Hague indicted criminals present on Serb-controlled territory. Easing sanctions throughout the past year has only been followed by Serbia's continued support for those responsible for war crimes and violations of humanitarian law, including the fall of Srebrenica and Zepa.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who have long sought to minimize the importance of this Tribunal. They have argued that it cannot succeed because we will not gain custody of the indicted—and therefore we need not try. They have argued that it cannot succeed because it lacks resources—and therefore we need not bother to provide it with the means to do the job we have given it. And they have argued that it cannot succeed because war criminals sit as negotiators—and therefore we should merely continue to negotiate with them rather than seek to bring them to justice. But even if those indicted this week are never brought to trial, this Tribunal has already ensured that they will be fugitives for the rest of their lives, subject to international arrest warrants wherever they go. Moreover, by identifying individual perpetrators, this court may pave the way for the innocent among all ethnic groups in this conflict to reconcile the divisions in society that these war criminals exploited for their own personal ends.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SMALL BUSINESS TRANSFER ACT OF 1995

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, one of the goals of the new Republican majority in Congress is to evaluate the performance and objectives of all federal programs and agencies. In undertaking such evaluations, I believe two fundamental questions need to be answered:

First, what aspects of the program or agency continue to serve a beneficial public policy purpose?

Second, how can we redesign the program or agency to perform the useful functions in a cost-effective manner?

Today, Representative JOEL HEFLEY, vice chairman of the Committee on Small Business, and I have introduced H.R. 2125, the Small Business Administration Transfer Act, which addresses these two questions in a positive way. In conversations with small business owners and their representatives here in Washington about the role of the Small Business Administration, I am told consistently that

the two areas were the Federal Government can be helpful are in providing access to capital and a voice at the highest levels of government. The remaining functions of the Small Business Administration have little to do with or actually hinder, small business growth.

The Small Business Transfer Act strengthens the programs that matters most to small business while saving taxpayers \$3 billion over 5 years. Under the legislation, the present Small Business Administration, with its outdated and heavily bureaucratic regional, district, and field structure, would cease to exist on October 1, 1996. An Office of Small Business Advocacy would be established in the Executive Office of the President. This office, which would function in a manner similar to the SBA's Office of Advocacy, will give small business a voice inside the White House.

The bill also establishes an Office of Small Business Lending in the Department of the Treasury. The office would consist of an Under Secretary, Deputy Under Secretary, and no more than 200 auditors who would administer a small business general loan guarantee program. All other SBA credit programs and revolving funds would be transferred to this office of servicing and liquidation.

The guaranteed loan program would function like the current Preferred Lenders Program, whereby the lender would have the complete authority to make close, service and liquidate loans. Maximum loan amounts would remain the same, but the guaranteed portion may not exceed 75 percent of the financing outstanding at the time the loan is made. No direct or immediate participation loans could be made.

To be eligible for a guaranteed loan, a business must meet:

First, the credit elsewhere test, denied credit by two lending institutions; second the definition of a small business; and third, the requirements of Section 7(a)(6) of the Small Business Act that all loans be of such sound value or so secured as reasonable to assure repayment.

For lenders to be eligible to participate in the program, the lender must maintain at least a 6-percent capital-to-asset ratio. The bill contains language explicitly subjecting lender loan portfolios to an annual compliance review conducted OSBL auditors. As an option, this could be done as part of an institution's overall compliance review conducted by the appropriate bank regulator.

The bill also contains language capping taxpayer exposure with excess or above historic average losses on each lender's portfolio. For example, if the lender's portfolio is 10 percent above the industry's historic loss average, the guarantee on loans originated by the lender would fall by 10 percent—from 75 percent to 68.5 percent.

The Treasury Secretary would be required to collect a minimum guarantee fee of 1/2 of 1 percent of the amount of the deferred participation share of any guaranteed loan. The lender would be permitted to finance the guar-

antee fee as part of the loan. The Treasury Secretary would be required to adjust the guarantee fee, subject to the normal reporting requirements, to ensure a guarantee fund that is self-financing.

The reforms made to the loan guarantee programs respond to a December 1992 General Accounting Office study of Housing and Community Development issues. The study made the following observations:

There has been no recent assessment of what sector of small business, if any, would receive financial assistance if SBA did not exist. Nor has there been a recent assessment of the economic impact that has resulted from billions of dollars in Federal guarantees that SBA has provided to small businesses. Yet in fiscal year 1992, SBA almost doubled the value of the business loans that it guaranteed—from \$3.8 billion in fiscal year 1991 to \$6.4 billion in fiscal year 1992. Our work has shown that SBA's loss rate is greater than that of private lenders and that SBA has not adequately overseen the operations of lenders receiving government loan guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, the reason the GAO's assessment of the SBA is so negative is that the agency's mission statement is faulty. In 1985, then OMB Director David Stockman called the SBA a billion-dollar waste—a rathole. Ten years later, the agency has undergone numerous reorganizations and credit reforms that have brought down default rates and improved the operations of credit programs. But the agency is still a failure because of the faulty premise that Government can create private sector jobs. Even if the Government could create private sector jobs, the SBA's programs are inconsistent with that mission.

Instead, what we have is an agency that reallocates credit to the least credit worthy; provides noncompetitive contracts to millionaire minorities at the expense of small business; plants trees at a cost of up to \$1,200 per tree; and provides \$70 million a year in grants to universities, which is the last place a small business person goes for advice.

In his book *"The Effective Executive"* Peter Drucker, my professor at the Claremont Graduate School, referred to an order by President Johnson that all Government agencies adopt program reviews to weed out obsolete and unproductive work. "This is a good first step, and badly needed," Drucker said. "But it will not produce results as long as we maintain the traditional assumption that all programs last forever unless proven to have outlived their usefulness. The assumption should rather be that all programs outlive their usefulness fast and should be scrapped unless proven productive and necessary. Otherwise, modern Government, while increasingly smothering society under rules, regulations, and forms, will itself be smothered in its own fat."

Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration has clearly outlived its usefulness. While I also question whether a guaranteed loan program remains productive and useful, there are legitimate concerns that excessive Government regulation of lending institutions has made it cost-prohibitive to lend to many

legitimate small businesses. Until those regulations can be eased, a case can be made for maintaining a loan guarantee program.

The Small Business Transfer Act offers a unique opportunity to make Government more effective by expanding small business capital, reducing taxpayer risk, and giving small business an antitax and antiregulatory voice at the highest level of Government. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring H.R. 2125.

IT IS TIME WE TRULY TAKE BACK OUR NEIGHBORHOODS

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to bolster our Nation's crime fighting efforts and to encourage citizens to get involved in crime prevention. I am joined in this effort by Congressman STUPAK, cochairman of the Law Enforcement Caucus—of which I am a member.

The Taking Back Our Neighborhoods Crime Fighting Act will give a \$50 tax credit to people actively involved in neighborhood watch groups and other organizations committed to the reduction of local crime.

I am proposing this tax credit because neighborhood watch works. It is the most effective crime reduction program available to our communities. Throughout the country, neighborhood watch groups have made people feel safer and more secure in their homes, parks, and streets.

Neighborhood watch establishes relationships among neighbors—and it establishes partnerships between neighborhoods and their police officers. Citizens are trained how to watch out for their families, monitor their neighborhoods, how to be observant and reliable witnesses, and how to assist their local police. Police chiefs and officers around the country firmly believe in neighborhood watch and have endorsed the idea of encouraging participation through tax credits.

Over the last decade, in my congressional district, we have pioneered the concept of community oriented crime fighting, and we have seen the difference it makes.

Serving on the San Diego Council for 5 years before I came to Congress, I worked hand in hand with residents to attack crime. We helped establish neighborhood watch groups. We went on walking patrols through the streets and created support networks among neighbors. We established drug free zones to keep dealers away from our schools. And we organized a graffiti patrol to clean up our neighborhoods and restore pride in our community.

We also worked directly with local police to create innovative crime fighting strategies. We instituted walking patrols in the streets, in the

schools, and in the neighborhoods. Police officers got to know the neighborhoods they protected and the people in them. They talked to residents, and residents knew exactly who to call if they saw someone in trouble.

These efforts have been successful. During the last year in San Diego, we have seen a reduction of at least 10 percent in every major category of crime.

And most importantly, we were empowered, we felt stronger, we fostered a sense of community, and we saw that we could make a difference in peoples lives.

Neighborhood watch groups have proven to be an effective and economical approach to providing a better and more secure society for ourselves and our children.

Giving people in neighborhood watch groups a \$50 tax break will support the many citizens already involved in crime prevention and encourage more community participation.

I ask my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation. Working together—and only by working together—can we truly start to reclaim our streets.

INTRODUCTION OF THE YELLOWSTONE BRUCellosIS-FREE MANAGEMENT ACT

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Yellowstone Brucellosis-Free Management Act to provide a comprehensive and practical strategy to address the problems of brucellosis in the Yellowstone.

Yellowstone, our Nation's first national park represents the true flowering of the idea of public lands set aside for the use and enjoyment and education of all the American people. It is unsurpassed in scenic beauty and natural features and remains today one of America's outstanding wildlife sanctuaries, little altered by human settlement.

Yellowstone provides refuge for rare and endangered species such as the threatened grizzly bear, the rare mountain lion and wolverine, bald eagles and trumpeter swans, the Yellowstone cutthroat trout and arctic grayling. The public lands surrounding Yellowstone offer complementary scenic vistas, recreational opportunities and outstanding wildlife habitat.

This greater Yellowstone area represents the largest undeveloped land of wilderness quality in the lower 48 States, and it includes the largest free-ranging herds of elk and bison in the world.

However, it is those herds, and particularly the bison, which have raised concerns about the risks of brucellosis which is carried by some animals in both herds. The dilemma is how do we protect the delicate wildlife inter-

relationships, the unique genetics of Yellowstone's wildlife and yet address the potential threat of brucellosis in the wildlife population and its possible transmission to livestock outside the park and resulting economic consequences to the livestock industry.

My legislation protects livestock producers from that threat and the harm of unfair economic sanctions by establishing a comprehensive framework for the National Park Service to address and manage and control brucellosis in the Yellowstone area.

For far too long, the bison-brucellosis controversy has swirled with hearsay, unsubstantiated claims and fear. This bill replaces fear with facts, rumor with research, supposition with science and, most important, it replaces talk with direct and specific action to remove the threat of brucellosis.

In the short term, this bill sanctions the interim bison management plan signed by the U.S. Forest Service, the State of Montana and Yellowstone National Park. It concurs with the need for a long term environmental impact statement in the form of a bison management plan. It also establishes the Yellowstone Brucellosis-Free Management Area with special regulations to provide economic stability in terms of the brucellosis-free status for the States of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho as long as the interim plans are in effect within the Yellowstone area.

One of the most important features of the bill is the prohibition on unfair or arbitrary sanctions imposed by APHIS on other States or livestock producers of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho because of the presence of brucellosis in wildlife within the Greater Yellowstone area.

In the long term, the bill directs the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to cooperate with the States of Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming in seeking the elimination of the diseases brucellosis from the Greater Yellowstone ecosystem. To accomplish this goal, the bill provides strong direction and authority for science-based management of the diseases.

The bill provides recognition of the facts that American Indians have long-standing spiritual and cultural ties to the American bison and, as such, have shown an interest in participating in the disposition of surplus bison for subsistence or to restore herds on American Indian lands.

Mister Speaker, this is a good bill for Montana's livestock producers. It protects their legitimate interests at the same time it provides for proper long-term management of Yellowstone's bison. This is a good bill for the bison. This is a good bill for the Yellowstone.

SIKHS DESERVE RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring the attention of the House to an extremely sensitive situation in India. In a time when civil rights abuses around the world are being condemned, the treatment of the Sikhs by the Indian Government should not go unnoticed.

This shameful treatment has included documented cases of rapes of young women, the beating of old men, and the murder of young boys. Innocent Sikh people have also been subjected to imprisonment without trial, and this practice has been occurring for more than a decade.

The Sikhs are being persecuted in their own homeland. They live in fear everyday, and the freedoms we take for granted simply do not exist in this part of India. Those Sikhs that have the courage to speak out against these abuses are often arrested and held for no reason.

The imprisonment of innocent Sikhs is made worse by the unfair treatment they receive once in prison. This despicable treatment all too often leads to the murder of innocent prisoners. Many times these deaths go unreported by police, and the bodies are cremated and, therefore, go unclaimed.

I believe this situation deserves and demands the attention of this body. Just as we have supported democratic reforms and the right to self-determination in Eastern Europe, I believe we should support independent and self-determination for Khalistan. The behavior of the Indian Government should not be tolerated, and their treatment of the Sikh people should be condemned.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES PUNJAB (TREATMENT OF SIKHS)

Mr. Terry Dicks (Hayes and Harlington): I wish to bring to the attention of the House the continuing persecution of the Sikhs living in their homeland, the Punjab—an issue that I have brought before the House on three previous occasions in the 12 years that I have been a Member of Parliament.

I noticed that nearly 30 hon. and right hon. Members were in the Chamber to listen to a debate about Bosnia, about which British people are not really interested because it is not of direct concern. We now have a debate—at least, a statement—about the position in a Commonwealth country, and the 30 people who were in the Chamber at 10 o'clock have almost all left. I find that surprising and disappointing.

Sikhs in my constituency and throughout the world are worried for relatives and friends who continue to live in that part of India. The rape of young women, the beating of old men and the murder of young boys, together with the imprisonment without trial of thousands of innocent people, have been taking place for more than a decade and continue to this day.

Living in fear in part of everyday existence in the Punjab. The freedom that we take for granted in Britain does not exist in that part of India.

Recent evidence obtained from police files shows that bodies of police suspects murdered in police custody have been cremated as "unclaimed" and that that practice has continued since 1984. The documents that I have with me were given by or bought from police authorities in the Punjab. They list names of people relating to the bodies that have been cremated; yet the Indian authorities denied the existence of such records.

The Indian Express carried a front-page story in its edition of 3 February 1995, in which it said that during the three years 1991-93, the Punjab police dumped about 426 bodies for cremation as "unclaimed" on the Patti Municipal Committee. In many cases, the relatives had not been informed even though the bodies had been identified.

In the same region last year, another 17 "unclaimed" bodies were sent by the police for cremation. Why cremation? Because burnt bodies cannot be examined later for evidence of torture or other abuse.

Police sources have disclosed that, although some of those so-called "missing persons" may have died as a result of torture while in police custody, others may have been eliminated because they had some evidence of police brutality—in other words, they had witnessed what was going on and they had to be put away together with those who were murdered as suspects.

A local human rights group brought that position to the attention of the Indian high court, but its action was dismissed on the grounds that only relatives of murdered individuals could be party to any litigation. That approach is a bit like telling the relatives of Kuwaitis who disappeared during the occupation of Kuwait to apply to the Iraqi high in Baghdad for an inquiry to be held into their disappearance.

Investigation into allegations of police torture are rare and, even when such allegations have been established, prosecutions have not taken place. According to recent reports by Amnesty International, there is no evidence of a police officer having been convicted of human rights violations in the Punjab. That says it all about the so-called free and democratic nature of that place and the police reaction to law and order.

The British Parliament has refused to condemn the behavior of the Indian Government, no matter how well documented the facts are. The Government refused, supposedly because India is a powerful Commonwealth Country. Indeed, India refers to itself as the "largest democracy in the world". Perhaps the phrase the "largest hypocrisy" is more appropriate; it is one that I use frequently to describe that Government and that country. The Labour party, with its close links with the Congress party and the Gandhi family, prefers to say nothing at all—I suppose that that is par for the course for that party.

Abuses elsewhere, such as in Bosnia and in parts of the Soviet Union, have led to condemnation by our Government. Why have the Indian Government escaped Britain's wrath? If the Indian Government have nothing to hide, what are they attempting to cover up? Why will they not grant me a visa

to enter the country? I reiterate my offer to the Indian Government; if my Sikh friends are telling me lies, I will condemn them outright upon my return from the Punjab; on the other hand, if the Indian Government have been misleading the rest of the world, I will shout the facts from the rooftops upon my return to Britain.

With such a reasonable offer available, perhaps the Government and my hon. Friend the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs will seek to persuade the Indian Government to grant me a visa. I sincerely hope that they will. As the elected representative of some 8,000 Sikhs, it is important that I see the position for myself. I hope that, with the help of the Foreign Office, I shall gain access to that country.

Recognition of the rights of Sikhs who are living in the Punjab is all that Sikhs elsewhere want. That means the right to press for self-determination and to strengthen the call for an independent Kalistan. Sikhs can not understand how Britain, which is their mother country in some ways, can take such determined action against the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and yet stand by and do nothing about human rights abuses in India. They wonder why they are treated differently, but they are also aware that the Punjab is not an oil-rich region. Our Government gives the impression that they are being selective in their opposition to human rights abuses. If that impression is to change, our Government must condemn outright the behavior of the Indian Government.

There should be no aid programmed to India, particularly because aid is now tied to good human rights practices. If that is the case, how can we give a penny to the Indian Government which use and abuse the Punjab people in their own country? If that has no effect, I believe that our Government should break off all diplomatic ties with India. Perhaps the "curry club" lunches between hon. Members in the House and the people who represent the Indian Government should also come to an end. There can be no appeasement of a Government who treat one of their ethnic minority groups in that way.

We are now celebrating the end of the second world war—a war that was fought to preserve freedom of expression, freedom from tyranny and freedom of self-determination. In the Punjab there is no freedom of expression, only its restriction. In the Punjab there is no freedom from tyranny, only the fear of tyranny. In the Punjab there is no freedom of self-determination, only the ability to whisper the word "Kalistan" because to do otherwise would put lives at risk.

For Sikhs in the Punjab, we should read Muslims in Kashmir. Who is causing their suffering? It is none other than the Indian Government. The Sikhs in the Punjab and the Muslims of Kashmir turn to us for help. They believe in the democratic principles upon which our Parliament is based. How much longer must they suffer and how many more excuses will be found to justify ignoring their pleas?

As I said earlier, this is the fourth time that I have raised the issue on the Floor of the House Commons. I suspect that, for the fourth time, my hon. Friend will read a Foreign Office brief and that no further action will be taken. I suspect that there will be no effort to help me to secure a visa to visit India. I suspect that the Government will

not raise the issue of human rights with the Indian Government and that they will not consider doing away with the aid programme because of the abuse of human rights in India. I shall probably hear—with great respect to my hon. Friend—platitudes and no firm decisions.

There are about 300,000 Sikhs in this country. The 9,000 Sikhs in my constituency will want to know how Parliament can spend hours talking about Bosnia—which is of no concern to this country in any shape or form: the Balkans were never part of the Commonwealth—and yet can debate this very important issue for half an hour four times in 12 years. I know that my hon. Friend the member of Gravesham (Mr. Arnold) has many Sikhs in his constituency, so I now give way to him to say whatever he wants to say.

Mr. Jacques Arnold (Gravesham): I am extremely grateful to my hon. friend the Member for Hayes and Harlington (Mr. Dicks) for raising this very important subject. As he said, many thousands of Sikhs live in Gravesend and Northfleet in my constituency. They are very concerned about their families and friends who remain in the Punjab and may hundreds of my Sikh constituents travel to the Punjab every year to visit them. They find the situation there to be extremely insecure. Constituents travel to the Punjab every year to visit them. They find the situation there to be extremely insecure.

In this country we take it for granted that human rights will always be preserved, and that if difficulties arise for ourselves and our families, in extremis we can turn to the police for help. Those are freedoms and rights not easily available to residents in the Punjab. Not only are their families vulnerable to the depredations of the police but, if things go wrong and they are the victims of extortion or violence of any sort, they cannot have recourse to the police authorities, as should be their right.

What remains in the Punjab is an extreme uneasiness for the individual, especially as there has been no proper investigation of the considerable number of cases of people who have disappeared over the years. Families throughout the Punjab—and therefore, by extension, families in this country—have seen their members disappear. Justice does not ensure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Let us have a little order here. First, I hope that the hon. Member for Gravesham (Mr. Arnold) has the Minister's permission too. This is not something that can just be done off the cuff, on the spur of the moment. Does the hon. Member have the Ministers' Permission?

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs (Mr. Tony Baldry): I am perfectly content for the hon. Member for Gravesham to intervene, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I was saying that many of my constituents are concerned about the lack of follow-up to the disappearances that have occurred in the Punjab, especially when young men from their extended families have disappeared. For instance, there was a ghastly case of a young man disappearing and all the stories were that he was being held in prison in a police station. The family was eventually advised that the young man had died in custody, yet only a few weeks later he was clearly seen at the window of the prison.

When the case was pursued with the prison authorities and the place was eventually checked out, the young man had disappeared yet again.

With my Latin American experience, I know about the concerns about those who have disappeared in Argentina. In the last decade of the 20th century such dreadful things are still happening.

It is especially relevant to raise the matter in the House of Commons, because until 1947 the House was responsible for the conduct of affairs in India. In some ways the agreement made by Mountbatten with the successor authorities, especially Nehru and the Congress party, for the creation of India led to the current position. The great Sikh leaders of

the day took at his word and at face value the promises that Mr. Nehru made them concerning the autonomy and the governance of greater Punjab, as it then was—promises that he subsequently broke.

As a result of the haste with which we left India and of the lack of care taken at the time to ensure that the legitimate rights of the Sikhs were sustained, we have a responsibility.

The debate is especially relevant this week, because over the past weekend we have celebrated Victory in Europe day. While I was doing so in my borough of Gravesham, I met an elderly Sikh visiting from India, who told me how he had served as a sergeant-major with the British forces

in Italy as part of the imperial Indian army under the Raj.

We owe a debt of gratitude to those people. We owe it to them to speak up for human rights in the Punjab, so that they can live in peace in the land of their forefathers.

Here is the true face of Indian "democracy" revealed for all to see. All over the world, their tyranny is being exposed. These strong statements reveal yet again that India is in truth a brutal, repressive tyranny which tortures and murders routinely. This is the truth that will cause India to collapse. Freedom for Khalistan and all the nations living under Indian occupation is inevitable. (Dr. G.S. Aulakh, President, Council of Khalistan.)